

REMARKS

This paper responds to the office action mailed on June 30, 2004. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended, claims 2-7 and 13-21 have been canceled, and new claims 22-35 have been added herein. Hence, claims 1, 8-12, and 22-35 are currently pending. Applicants request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Priority

The specification has been amended to recite the patent number issuing from the priority applications as required by the office action.

Drawings

Figure 15 has been added to illustrate the embodiment recited in original claims 5-7. Figure 15 merely graphically illustrates that which was verbally described in the specification. No new matter has been added. Applicants thus believe the objection to the drawings has been overcome.

Specification

The specification has been amended to correct some informal errors, and to reference new Figure 15, which illustrates the embodiment recited in original claims 5-7. Applicants thus believe the objection to the specification has been overcome.

Double Patenting

Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. These claims have been canceled, rendering the rejection moot.

Claim rejections

The office action noted that claims 7 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 5-7, it is therefore intended to represent claim 7 in independent form. Claim 11 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 18-20, it is therefore intended to represent claim 20 in independent form.

Applicants therefore submit claims 1 and 11, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are all condition for allowance.

New claims


New claims 28-31 have been added herein. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 28-31 are also patentable because none of the cited prior art discloses or suggest the use of flaps to permanently attach an adapter to a friction-based hose receptacle such that when so attached the friction-based hose receptacle is converted into a locking hose receptacle. Moreover, there is no suggestion in the prior art to combine the cited prior art to come up with the claimed invention since the references discussed by the examiner in the parent application disclose removable methods of latching, wherein the flaps of claims 28-31 are adapted to permanently attach

the adapter the friction-based hose receptacle. Such permanent attachment runs contrary to the teachings of Fitzwater and Keane.

Conclusion

As evidenced by the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants have made a genuine effort to address each issue raised in the office action. All of the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney with any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Gleason
Reg. No. 39,998
Attorney for Applicants

LOCKE LIDDELL & SAPP LLP
600 Travis, #3400
Houston, Texas 77002

Date: 12/30/04